R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 945 JC 680 188

A STUDY OF VOTER REACTION TO A COMBINATION BOND-TAX ELECTION ON MARCH 26, 1968.

BY- WITT, IRVING M. PEARCE, FRANK C.
SAN MATEO COLL., CALIF.

REPORT NUMBER CSM-RR-1968-1 PUB DATE 11 MAR 68
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.72 16P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *TAX SUPPORT, *BOND ISSUES, *PUBLIC OPINION, *COMMUNITY SURVEYS, SCHOOL TAXES, VOTING, QUESTIONNAIRES, SCHOOL FUNDS, SAN MATEO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

THIS WAS A STUDY OF SAN MATEO VOTERS AND THEIR PRE-ELECTION REACTIONS TO A COMBINED TAX AND BOND PROPOSAL TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE FUNDS. IT PROPOSED (1) TO DETERMINE HOW MANY WOULD VOTE FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSALS, (2) TO IDENTIFY ISSUES IMPORTANT TO VOTERS IN MAKING THEIR DECISIONS, (3) TO CHARACTERIZE THOSE VOTING YES OR NO TO SEE WHO NEEDED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, (4) TO DETERMINE THE VOTERS' KNOWLEDGE OF THE ISSUES. SPOT POLLS WERE TAKEN BEFORE THE ELECTION TO FIND OUT WHY PEOPLE DID OR DID NOT SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS AND TO SHOW AS GREAT A REPRESENTATION OF THE VOTERS AS POSSIBLE. THE 14-ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE, USED FOR 1661 INTERVIEWS, IS SHOWN. CONCLUSIONS FROM THE POLLS INCLUDED (1) WHILE BOTH ISSUES WOULD PASS, MORE VOTERS FAVORED THE BOND THAN THE TAX PROPOSAL, (2) CERTAIN ISSUES EMERGED THAT SHOULD BE STRESSED IN PRESENTING THE PROPOSALS, (3) ABOUT TWO-THIRDS OF THOSE INTERVIEWED RATED THE COLLEGE WELL, MOSTLY THROUGH PERSONAL CONTACT, (4) CERTAIN AREAS OF THE COUNTY WERE LESS AGREEABLE TO THE PROPOSALS, (5) VOTERS MORE THAN 50 YEARS OLD (WITHOUT CHILDREN UNDER 21) WERE LESS IN FAVOR, PARTICULARLY OF THE TAX PROPOSAL, (6) WHITE-COLLAR AND PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE SHOWED MORE FAVORABLE RESPONSE THAN BLUE-COLLAR WORKERS, HOUSEWIVES, OR RETIRED PEOPLE, (7) THOSE IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSALS WERE MORE LIKELY TO VOTE, AND (8) VOTERS WHO FELT THEY KNEW ABOUT THE ISSUES WERE MORE LIKELY TO VOTE "YES" FOR THEM. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED019945

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 25 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO

RESEARCH REPORT

1968-1

A STUDY OF VOTER REACTION

TO A COMBINATION BOND-TAX ELECTION ON MARCH 26, 1968

By Dr. Irving M. Witt
and
Dr. Frank C. Pearce

JC 680 188

SAN MATEO JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT
OFFICE OF RESEARCH
FRANK C. PEARCE, HEAD

Lachlan Throndson

Office of Research
College of San Mateo

March 11, 1968

A STUDY OF VOTER REACTION TO A COMBINATION BOND-TAX ELECTION ON MARCH 26, 1968

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Trustees of the San Mateo Junior College District has determined that additional funds will be needed to finance the operational and capital outlay requirements of the several colleges within the district. To meet this need the Board has directed that two proposals be placed before the voters on March 26, 1968. The first asks for permission to sell bonds, and the second proposal calls for a permissive tax override. The acceptability of these proposals to the voters of San Mateo County is the subject of this study.

PURPOSE

The first phase of this study is designed to assess the reaction of persons throughout San Mateo County to the Bond-Tax proposals of the San Mateo Junior College District.

OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the number of people who will vote for or against the election proposals.
2. To identify issues which voters consider when deciding how they will cast their votes. In effect, the items of importance to voters that must be included in discussions of the proposals.
3. To characterize those persons who will vote for or against the proposals so that the groups which require additional attention will be known.
4. To describe the extent of the voter's knowledge about the election.

PROCEDURE

The spot polls will be conducted twice prior to the election. Phase one, the first spot poll was designed to give as much information as possible on why people did or did not intend to support the proposals; while phase two, the second spot poll, was designed to be as representative of San Mateo voters as possible.

Phase one consisted of a structured interview schedule administered by College students at a variety of places and locations throughout the County. Specifically, 424 interviews were held in shopping centers, 34 in bowling alleys, 160 in grocery stores, 696 in the person's home, 77 in various retail stores and business offices, 48 at College of San Mateo, 23 on city streets, 16 in post offices, 29 in hospitals, 21 in restaurants, 17 in gas stations, 14 in beauty parlors and barber shops, 13 in parking lots, 13 in laundries, 12 in car washes, 11 in churches, 11 in real estate offices, 9 in libraries, 5 at the airport, and 3 at a bus depot.

The schedules were coded and edited as the students returned them, and those schedules that students had completed themselves or those in which College of San Mateo students were involved were not included in the study. A program edited by Bob Decelle at the Computer Center was used to compare and analyze the data.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

The prediction of voter reaction can be a relatively simple process if there is a strong inclination among voters to lean in one direction rather than another. However, when taxes and education are involved, the results are quite unpredictable since most people favor education and oppose taxes. Thus, the outcome depends upon which of their concerns is currently the stronger of the two. In addition to this difficulty, the findings of this study must be viewed in terms of several important limitations.

1. Time -- since the study was conducted nearly four weeks prior to the election and the findings can be expected to change.

2. Interviewer bias -- since students were used to conduct the interviews, it can be expected that many voters will be more positive in their responses than they actually feel.

3. Uncertain voters -- since the direction of their voting reaction can only be estimated and when an election is very close, very small deviations from the study results among uncertain voters can change the entire outcome.

FINDINGS

Interviews were held with 1661 persons throughout San Mateo County. Several of these individuals failed to respond to every question, causing some variation in the total figures reported in the findings. Based upon the simple question of, "How would you vote on the bond proposal if the election were today?" it was found that 70.4 percent intended to vote yes, 11.6 percent no, and 18.0 percent were undecided. For the same question on the tax proposal, 54.3 percent indicated they would vote yes, 22.7 percent no, and 23.0 percent were undecided. In effect, if the election had been held during the last week of February, both issues would have passed. At the same time, however, it must be recognized that something might happen to change the minds of voters during the next four weeks and that these results will change. In addition, these are gross results that include inconsistencies and other clues as to how the person may really vote.

One method of refining these figures was to examine the reasons people gave for voting one way or another and then comparing these reasons with how they had said they were going to vote. For example, 61 persons said they were undecided on the bond proposal, yet they gave very negative reasons for why they were undecided. This was also the case for 59 persons on the tax issue. Another 14 made negative comments about the administration's liberal nature or management of the College but still claimed they would vote yes on the proposals. Using this rationale, it would appear that a more realistic estimate of voter reaction would be: Bond proposal -- 68.4 percent yes, 15.2 percent no, and 16.4 percent undecided; tax proposal -- 53.2 percent yes, 26.3 percent no, and 20.5 percent undecided.

Another approach to assessing the strength of voter reaction to the proposals was to ask people how they felt or rated the College and specifically, why they rated the College as they did. Once again, this was a question of assessing the respondent's consistency. For example, 19 percent of those persons (5.7 percent of the voters) who made comments about the College were critical of the administration--the management of the college, that it was too liberal; that it admitted students who were not serious; that you couldn't get the evening or day college classes you wanted; parking was inadequate;

or that they had more important things to do than be concerned about the College. Taking these comments into consideration and comparing them to how people said they would vote, it wasfound that voter reaction to the bond proposal should be reported as: 68 percent yes, 14 percent no, and 18 percent undecided. On the other hand, reaction to the tax proposal would be reported as: yes -- 52 percent, no -- 24 percent, and undecided -- 24 percent. In effect, the proposals are passing -- but just barely.

The second major question in this study was "What factors were the voters considering as they decided how they would vote?" Table I provides general categories of the reasons people gave for voting one way or another. It should be noted that both positive and negative reasons can be used to provide insight into the type of topics that should be emphasized during presentations or discussions on the proposals. For example, persons who see education as a means for improving the community, state, or nation; preparing ourselves for future growth and development, enhancing the development of our youth; raising our standard of living; or as a means of reaching other goals of general improvement will probably vote "yes" on the proposals. This could also be said of those persons who wanted a college closer to their homes, more colleges in the County, better educational facilities, or an equal chance for everyone to have a college education. The probability of persons who wanted to reduce class size, take the load off the universities or make College of San Mateo into a four-year college voting "yes" was approximately 15 percent lower; that is, a 75 percent probability of voting "yes."

Additional positive reasons with a 90 percent probability of yielding a yes vote were: I have children who will be going and I want the College to be ready for them; the College is overcrowded with the population increasing so fast that more colleges are needed to prevent overcrowding; it is the least expensive means for obtaining a college education; we will need it eventually and it will cost less today than it will later; taxes for education are the best tax dollars we spend, or I want to show "Regan" we want and will support education; and so we can maintain our high educational standards. Essentially, it would appear that a wide variety of reasons should be stressed in presentations on passing the election proposals. In fact, the 16 percent of the voters who could give no reasons for how they would vote or simply hadn't decided might find the above points of interest.

TABLE I - REASONS FOR VOTING BEHAVIOR

	YES		NO		UNDECIDED	
REASONS	Bond	Tax	Bond	Tax	Bond	Tax
Education is important	305	273	3	17	6	24
Benefits the whole community	69	63	1	3	1	6
We need better and more colleges	88	63	-	10	-	15
We need good facilities	44	36	1	5	1	5
Gives all a chance for higher education	71	64	1	4	5	9
Other reasons	10	10	1	1	-	-
Need more information	14	2	3	7	90	98
It will benefit my children	110	100	-	4	3	9
Overcrowded - population increasing	116	91	1	11	-	15
Inexpensive education	19	19	-	-	1	1
Costs less now than later	6	5	-	-	-	1
Best use of tax dollar	40	38	2	4	3	3
To maintain high standards	12	12	-	-	-	-
Will increase taxes	95	1	64	156	30	33
Administration too liberal	2	-	8	9	2	3
Charge tuition	8	1	15	21	4	5
No personal benefit	5	1	25	33	16	12
Poor management	5	2	16	22	5	2
More campuses not needed	-	1	16	16	4	4

The negative reasons listed in Table I also give some points that should be raised during presentations. Assuming, that is, that the reason a person has decided to vote against the proposals is based on logic and not emotion. Obviously, many of the negative reasons are based primarily on emotion, and as such, will be difficult if not impossible to change. For example, the 156

who said taxes are already too high (about 10 percent of the people interviewed) are not likely to vote for the override no matter what one says. At the same time, however, some of them will vote for the bonds since bonds don't raise taxes (?) In effect, it would seem that the feelings of such persons about the word "tax" are stronger than their feelings about the word "education."

Other persons who react negatively to the proposals feel that the College is too liberal (one percent of those interviewed) in dealing with the students on issues such as drugs, sex, or controversial speakers. Asking the students to pay tuition or at least part of the operational expense was the point of view of 1.6 percent of those interviewed. Several felt the community should put up the buildings, but the students should pay for the remainder of the expenses. Persons who had no children who would attend or who had no plans themselves to attend felt the proposals were not going to benefit them, so they would vote against both issues. Approximately 30 people found serious fault with the management of the College, such as hiring poor teachers, not using the last bond money properly, or general inefficiency. Nearly the same number of people felt that only one junior college was needed in San Mateo County. In summary, both negative and positive comments raise several specific points that should be covered during presentations throughout the County.

Another attempt to gain information on why people intended to vote one way or another was directed through the question of how people felt about the College -- their rating of it as a college and why they rated it that way. It was found that 22.4 percent rated the College as excellent, 46.9 percent felt it was good, 18.7 percent felt it was average, 1.9 percent considered it poor or worse, and 10 percent held no opinion regarding the College of San Mateo. Table II shows that the person's rating was directly related to how he intended to vote. For example, three-fourths of those who considered the College excellent intended to vote "yes" on the bonds, while two-thirds intended to vote "yes" on the tax proposal. At the same time, individuals who knew very little about the College tended to indicate undecided or no votes.

TABLE II - VOTER REACTIONS TO THE COLLEGE AND THE ELECTION PROPOSALS

Rating of College	Bond Proposal			Tax Proposal		
	Yes	Undecided	No	Yes	Undecided	No
Excellent	28.7%	8.4%	5.7%	31.2%	11.9%	12.0%
Good	50.5	41.6	33.4	50.5	48.4	37.4
Average	14.1	27.1	33.9	12.2	23.4	29.7
Poor	0.7	2.7	5.2	0.6	1.8	3.7
Very Poor	---	---	1.5	0.1	---	0.7
No Opinion	6.0	18.9	20.3	5.4	14.5	16.5
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Only 602 persons provided a reason for the rating they gave the College. Twenty percent based their rating on the comments they had heard others make; another 20 percent had known someone who was or had attended the college, while 14 percent had attended day or evening classes. In effect, over one-half simply said personal knowledge or contact was the basis for their rating. Another 10 percent were much more specific in their feeling that the College served the whole community, providing a wide variety of day and evening programs. Moreover, 10 percent were very impressed with the quality of the instructional staff, while 7 percent commented on how well the College was run, its president, or its high standards. The critical comments were mentioned earlier in this report since they reflected voter opinion and behavior to a much greater degree. In fact, those who gave meaningful positive comments were much more likely to indicate a yes vote than the person who said he had known a student at the College.

This brings us to a third objective of this report: the kinds of people or places where more attention should be directed, especially along the lines previously outlined in this report. Table III shows the way people planned to vote on March 26 by geographic area. The County was divided into seven

basic areas, three east of El Camino and four west of El Camino including the Coastside. In terms of the bond proposal, it appeared the people who reside east of El Camino and in the north and south ends of the County plus those on the Coastside had a much lower proportion of yes votes than the other areas. Yet, the northeastern and southeastern areas also had a much higher proportion of undecided votes than expected, while the Coastside was primarily against the bond proposal. Generally, persons living on the west side of El Camino tended to be the more positive toward the bond proposal.

TABLE III

VOTING BEHAVIOR OF PERSONS FROM VARIOUS PARTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Part of County	VOTING INTENTION: YES f	YES %	NO f	NO %	UNDECIDED f	UNDECIDED %	TOTAL f	TOTAL %
BOND PROPOSAL								
Northeast	77	61.6	19	15.2	29	23.2	125	100
Central-East	167	70.4	28	11.8	41	17.2	236	100
Southeast	97	62.9	16	10.3	40	25.9	153	100
Northwest	264	74.3	34	9.5	55	15.4	353	100
Central-West	326	72.7	48	10.7	74	16.5	448	100
Southwest	207	72.6	32	11.2	45	15.7	284	100
Coastside	25	56.8	13	29.5	6	13.6	44	100
TAX PROPOSAL								
Northeast	63	50.4	36	28.8	26	20.8	125	100
Central-East	120	50.6	60	25.3	57	24.0	237	100
Southeast	73	47.4	32	20.7	48	31.0	153	100
Northwest	196	55.2	83	23.3	76	21.4	355	100
Central-West	268	59.8	83	18.5	97	21.6	448	100
Southwest	156	54.7	58	20.3	70	24.5	284	100
Coastside	18	40.9	23	52.2	3	6.8	44	100

In terms of the tax proposal, Table III shows the people who reside on the west side of El Camino tended to be more positive than persons who lived east of El Camino or on the Coastside. At the same time, persons living southeast of El Camino were quite undecided about the tax proposal.

In effect, additional efforts east of El Camino and on the Coastside for both proposals and in the southwest on the tax proposal could be advantageous.

Another possible way of differentiating among the groups of people where additional attention could be productive was by the respondent's age. It was found that persons estimated at 50 years of age or less tended to be more likely to indicate a "yes" vote on either the bond or tax proposal than people over fifty years of age. However, these older persons were more negative toward the tax proposal than they were toward the bond proposal. In fact, if they didn't indicate a "yes" vote, it was found that there was a 60 percent probability that they were undecided about the bonds.

At this point, one immediately associates age and children to form the assumption that these older citizens do not have children under 21 years of age. Table IV supports this contention to some degree since the question "Do you have any children under 21 years of age?" indicates both the respondent's age and whether he has children. It was noted that in terms of both proposals, persons who were young enough to have children under 21 and who had such children were more likely to vote yes on both proposals. However, the relationship was far from exact, and it was clear that considerations other than age and children were of importance to many of these people. These factors were explored to some degree earlier in this report.

TABLE IV - VOTING BEHAVIOR OF PERSONS WITH AND WITHOUT COLLEGE-AGE CHILDREN

	CHILDREN OF COLLEGE AGE				
	YES		NO		
VOTER INTENTION	f	%	f	%	TOTAL
		BONDS			
YES	797	74.4	348	63.7	1145
NO	104	9.7	81	14.8	185
UNDECIDED	170	15.9	117	21.5	287
TOTAL	1071	100%	546	100%	1617
		TAX			
YES	613	57.1	267	48.4	880
NO	223	20.8	147	26.9	370
UNDECIDED	237	22.1	133	24.3	370
TOTAL	1073	100%	547	100%	1620

The question of whether these proposals were viewed any differently by men than they were by women was also assessed. There were no differences in the stated voting intentions of the two groups. Males were just as positive or negative about both proposals as were the females. There were 772 males interviewed and 865 females interviewed. Interviewers were also asked to guess at the respondent's possible status, which is a tenuous business at best based upon dress (income), mode of speech (education), and occupation. Many interviewers simply asked the respondent for his occupation, and the number of people shown in each category could be quite accurate in this regard. Table V shows that at this point in time support for both proposals among professional people is quite high, while it is very good among white-collar workers. Blue-collar workers and housewives favor the bonds but clearly oppose the tax override. Retired persons tend to be against both proposals. It was also found that blue-collar workers, housewives, and retired persons indicated a substantial amount of uncertainty about both proposals.

TABLE V - OCCUPATION AND VOTING INTENTION

	VOTING INTENTION						
	YES		NO		UNDECIDED		TOTAL
OCCUPATION	f	%	f	%	f	%	f
			BOND PROPOSAL				
Professional	273	78.8	37	10.6	37	10.6	347
White Collar	513	74.6	62	8.9	113	16.5	688
Blue Collar	283	62.0	71	15.6	103	22.5	457
Housewife	50	62.6	8	9.9	22	27.5	80
Retired	3	23.0	5	38.5	5	38.5	13
			TAX PROPOSAL				
Professional	236	68.1	58	16.7	53	15.2	347
White Collar	403	58.6	135	19.5	151	21.9	689
Blue Collar	181	39.6	144	31.4	133	29.0	458
Housewife	35	43.9	19	23.7	26	32.4	80
Retired	3	23.0	5	38.5	5	38.5	13

These findings, however, raise once again the age-old question in a school election: "Who will vote?" At the time of this survey one can only guess and assume that previous turnouts of 20 percent or so will again occur. One additional step was taken, however, through the question: "Since the issues that will be on the ballot concern only our junior colleges, how important do you feel it is that people in San Mateo County vote?" Table VI shows that 63 percent of the persons interviewed felt voting in the election was of great importance (which is the expected answer in our society, and less people will actually vote), and 29 percent considered voting in the election of some importance. In effect, about two-thirds indicated they would vote and the preponderance of these people were in favor of both proposals. This table also raises a point some might consider technical, and that is the sampling error. In effect, unless reported otherwise, the figures reported in this study have a 90 percent probability of being accurate. This is acceptable statistically and perhaps better than one should expect. However, it is of obvious importance in this election, which is quite close.

TABLE VI - IMPORTANCE OF VOTING AND VOTER INTENTION

VOTER INTENTION	VERY IMPORTANT f	%	IMPORTANT f	%	NOT IMPORTANT f	%
			BOND PROPOSAL			
YES	845	82.9	291	61.7	17	12.9
NO	79	7.8	45	9.5	64	48.5
UNDECIDED	95	9.3	136	28.8	51	38.6
TOTAL	1019	100%	472	100%	132	100%
			TAX PROPOSAL			
YES	676	66.3	207	43.8	7	5.3
NO	180	17.6	113	23.9	77	57.9
UNDECIDED	164	16.1	153	32.3	49	36.9
TOTAL	1020	100%	473	100%	133	100%

The final question asked by the study was whether people had heard about the election and whether they knew about the proposals. It was found that 61 percent of the people interviewed claimed to have heard that the Junior College District was holding an election, 31 percent had not heard about it, and the remainder were undecided. It was also noted that the probability of a voter intending to vote "yes" increased in direct proportion to the certainty with which he said he had heard about the election. In effect, if he was certain he had heard about it, there was a 70 percent probability that he would vote "yes" on the bond proposal and a 60 percent probability that he would vote "yes" on the tax override.

Table VII shows that 23 percent of the people knew about the bond proposal only, 3 percent knew about the tax proposal only, 27 percent knew about both proposals, and 47 percent did not know about either proposal. Once again, Table VII shows that the people who knew about both proposals were more likely to favor the proposals than persons who knew about only one proposal. It would appear that the voters support is directly proportional to his knowledge of it, and there are still quite a number of people in San Mateo County who know very little, if anything, about the election proposals.

TABLE VII - VOTER KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE ELECTION

VOTER INTENTION	PROPOSALS VOTER KNEW ABOUT: BOND f	BOND %	TAX f	TAX %	BOND & TAX f	BOND & TAX %	UNDECIDED f	UNDECIDED %
BOND ISSUE								
YES	254	84.7	19	52.8	298	84.9	373	61.6
NO	17	5.7	7	19.4	33	9.4	86	14.2
UNDECIDED	29	9.6	10	27.8	20	5.7	146	24.2
TOTAL	300	100%	36	100%	351	100%	605	100%
TAX PROPOSAL								
YES	186	62.0	18	50.0	262	74.6	289	47.5
NO	52	17.3	8	22.2	60	17.1	156	25.7
UNDECIDED	62	20.7	10	27.8	29	8.3	163	26.8
TOTAL	300	100%	36	100%	351	100%	608	100%

CONCLUSIONS

1. That at least 68 percent of the persons interviewed are in favor of the bond proposal, 14 percent are against it, and 18 percent are undecided.

2. That at least 52 percent of the persons interviewed are in favor of the tax proposal, 25 percent are against it, and 23 percent are undecided.

3. That there are a number of issues indicated in the findings that should be stressed during any presentation of the proposals. Moreover, the issues identified allow stressing of positive points as well as rebuttal of negative points during a presentation.

4. That approximately two-thirds of the persons interviewed rated the College of San Mateo as good or excellent, and the majority of these people had made some personal contact with the College at one time or another.

5. That persons who live east of El Camino Real in San Mateo County and those who live on the Coastside are the most negative toward both proposals. However, this does not negate the need for continuing efforts in other parts of the County.

6. That persons fifty years of age or more and/or persons without children under 21 years of age tend to view both proposals in a negative light. However, they tend to be more strongly inclined toward defeating the tax proposal than they are the bond proposal. In fact, it is very apparent that many people will split their votes on these issues.

7. That professional people and white-collar workers are generally in favor of both proposals. However, people identified as blue-collar workers, housewives, or retired people tend to be against the bond proposal and very much opposed to the tax proposal.

CONCLUSIONS (continued)

8. That it would appear at this point in time persons who are in favor of the proposals are also the persons who are more likely to actually cast their ballots. Admittedly, however, this is a very tenuous conclusion at best.

9. That the more strongly a voter feels that he knows about the issues proposed in the election the more likely he is to vote "yes." In effect, as the amount of information he possesses increases, the probability of his voting in favor of the proposals also increases. At the same time, nearly one-half of the people knew very little about the proposals, even to the extent that a bond and tax were involved.

10. That the election will be very close if the conditions at the time of this spot poll still prevail on March 26, 1968. It would appear that the bond should pass, but the tax override carries a strong negative connotation among the citizens of San Mateo County.

* * *

SAN MATEO JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT ELECTION OPINION POLL

(1) DO YOU LIVE EAST OR WEST OF EL CAMINO? (Then ask:) DO YOU LIVE IN THE NORTHERN, CENTRAL OR SOUTHERN PART OF THIS COUNTY?

East of El Camino areas:
_____ 1 Northern part of County
_____ 2 Central part of County
_____ 3 Southern part of County

West of El Camino areas:
_____ 4 Northern part of County
_____ 5 Central part of County
_____ 6 Southern part of County

(2) DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN WHO ARE UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE?
_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No

(3) FROM WHAT YOU KNOW ABOUT THE COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO, DO YOU FEEL IT IS A GOOD COLLEGE, A POOR COLLEGE -- HOW WOULD YOU RATE IT?
_____ 1 Excellent, outstanding, etc.
_____ 2 Good, above average, etc.
_____ 3 Average, OK, adequate, etc.
_____ 4 Poor, below average, etc.
_____ 5 Terrible, very bad, etc.
_____ 6 I don't know; no opinion

(4) COMMENTS: _____
(5) _____
(6) _____

(7) HAVE YOU HEARD THAT THE JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT IS HOLDING AN ELECTION?
_____ 1 Yes (go to question 8)
_____ 2 No (go to question 9)
_____ 3 Uncertain (go to question 9)

(8) DO YOU KNOW WHAT THE TWO PROPOSALS ARE THAT THE SAN MATEO COLLEGE DISTRICT IS ASKING THE VOTERS TO CONSIDER? (Could you tell me a little about them?)
_____ 1 Yes (knows about the bond issue)
_____ 2 Yes (knows about tax override)
_____ 3 Yes (knows about both)
_____ 4 No or just not sure

(9) SINCE THE ISSUES THAT WILL BE ON THE BALLOT CONCERN ONLY OUR JUNIOR COLLEGES, HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU FEEL IT IS THAT PEOPLE IN SAN MATEO COUNTY VOTE?
_____ 1 Very important, of great importance, or other very positive reply.
_____ 2 Important, they should or other moderate to undecided reaction.
_____ 3 Not too important or other generally unenthusiastic reaction.

(10) ONE OF THE PROPOSALS IN THIS ELECTION IS A BOND ISSUE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS AT THE DISTRICT'S SKYLINE AND CAÑADA COLLEGES. DO YOU FEEL YOU WOULD VOTE IN FAVOR OF THIS PROPOSAL OR AGAINST IT IF THE ELECTION WERE HELD TODAY? _____ 1 For it _____ 2 Against it _____ 3 Undecided

(11) THE OTHER PROPOSAL FOR THIS ELECTION IS A TAX INCREASE TO BUY FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE TWO NEW COLLEGES AND PAY OPERATING COSTS FOR THREE COLLEGES. IF THE ELECTION WERE HELD TODAY, DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD VOTE FOR THIS PROPOSAL OR AGAINST IT?
_____ 1 For it _____ 2 Against it _____ 3 Undecided

(INTERVIEWER: Based upon the responses given to questions 7 and 8, ask the following question if you do not know the answer already.)

(12) WHY DO YOU PLAN TO VOTE FOR/AGAINST THESE PROPOSALS? _____
(13) _____
(14) _____

INTERVIEWER: Check answers off list:

(15) Respondent's sex:

_____ 1 Male

_____ 2 Female

(16) Respondent's approximate age:

_____ 1 Twenty-five or less

_____ 2 26 to 50

_____ 3 Over 50

(17) Respondent's possible socio-economic status:

_____ 1 Professional

_____ 2 White collar

_____ 3 Blue collar

(18) Where was the interview held?

_____ 1 Shopping center

_____ 2 Bowling alley

_____ 3 Grocery store

_____ 4 Respondent's home

_____ Other (Specify)_____